

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
DIVISION TWO

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Respondent,

v.

TAMARA CHURCHILL,

Appellant.

ON APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF
THE STATE OF WASHINGTON FOR KITSAP COUNTY

The Honorable Jennifer A. Forbes

REPLY BRIEF OF APPELLANT

THOMAS M. KUMMEROW
Attorney for Appellant

WASHINGTON APPELLATE PROJECT
1511 Third Avenue, Suite 701
Seattle, Washington 98101
(206) 587-2711
tom@washapp.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. ARGUMENT	1
The search of Ms. Churchill’s purse was unlawful under the United States and Washington Constitutions.	1
B. CONCLUSION	4

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

WASHINGTON CASES

<i>State v. Lohr</i> , 164 Wn.App. 414, 263 P.3d 1287 (2011)	2
<i>State v. Sinclair</i> , ____ Wn.App. ____, (72102-0-I, January 27, 2016)	3
<i>State v. Worth</i> , 37 Wn.App. 889, 683 P.2d 622 (1984)	2

A. ARGUMENT

The search of Ms. Churchill's purse was unlawful under the United States and Washington Constitutions.

The State's entire argument rests on the fact that there were additional purses in the apartment, thus the police could not know the purse on the sofa at Ms. Churchill's feet was hers. Brief of Respondent at 6-13. The State never answers the issue raised by Ms. Churchill that the fact the purse was discovered at Ms. Churchill's feet on the sofa upon which she sat gave the officers sufficient notice that the purse was hers.

Initially, the State faults Ms. Churchill for not challenging the search warrant or designating it. Brief of Respondent at 5. Ms. Churchill has no qualms with the warrant. As the trial court found in Finding of Fact 1, the warrant was targeted at Anthony Anderson and there was no mention in the warrant or supporting affidavit that any women were assisting Mr. Anderson in his drug transactions. CP 102-03. Thus, the warrant did not name Ms. Churchill and there was no need to challenge the warrant since she was not named in the warrant and the police could not use the warrant as a basis to search her purse.

The State also faults Ms. Churchill for not challenging the findings of fact that found that there were other purses and bags found in the apartment. Brief of Respondent at 6-8. This fact is of no moment to Ms. Churchill's argument. Thus there was no need to challenge them.

As noted, the State's entire argument rests on these additional bags and purses that were found in the apartment. But the State ignores the most damaging fact regarding its argument; the purse was found at her feet on the sofa. Ms. Churchill was found lying on a sofa. CP 85; 3/30/2015RP 32. On the sofa was a purse. CP 85; 3/30/2015RP 35. The purse was close to Ms. Churchill's legs and was the only purse on the sofa. 3/30/2015RP 42.

As a consequence, as argued in the Brief of Appellant, Ms. Churchill's case is much more similar to the facts and results stated in *State v. Worth*, 37 Wn.App. 889, 683 P.2d 622 (1984), and *State v. Lohr*, 164 Wn.App. 414, 263 P.3d 1287 (2011). Brief of Appellant at 9-12. Given the proximity of the purse to Ms. Churchill and the fact the purse was the only purse on the sofa, the police had to ample facts to conclude the purse was Ms. Churchill's. As such, the search of the

purse was impermissible and the methamphetamine should be suppressed.

Finally, in addition to Ms. Churchill's argument that the trial court erred in failing to conduct a meaningful inquiry into her ability to pay trial legal financial obligations, Ms. Churchill asks this Court to order that no costs be awarded on appeal in light of her continued indigency and probable difficulty in acquiring employment given her felony conviction. *State v. Sinclair*, ____ Wn.App. ____, slip op. at 10-12 (72102-0-I, January 27, 2016).

B. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated in the previously filed Brief of Appellant as well as this reply brief, Ms. Churchill asks this Court to reverse the trial court's order denying her motion to suppress and order the methamphetamine suppressed. Alternatively, Ms. Churchill asks this Court to remand the matter for a new sentencing hearing at which the court would engage in an individualized inquiry into Ms. Churchill's ability to pay the LFOs prior to the imposition of any LFOs. Finally, in the event this Court affirms Ms. Churchill's conviction and sentence, she asks this Court to order that no costs be imposed because she was found indigent at trial and for the purpose of this appeal.

DATED this 2nd day of March 2016.

Respectfully submitted,

s/Thomas M. Kummerow

THOMAS M. KUMMEROW (WSBA 21518)
Washington Appellate Project – 91052
1511 Third Avenue, Suite 701
Seattle, WA. 98101
(206) 587-2711
Fax (206) 587-2710
tom@washapp.org
Attorneys for Appellant

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
DIVISION TWO**

STATE OF WASHINGTON,)	
)	
Respondent,)	
)	NO. 47756-4-II
v.)	
)	
TAMARA CHURCHILL,)	
)	
Appellant.)	

DECLARATION OF DOCUMENT FILING AND SERVICE

I, MARIA ARRANZA RILEY, STATE THAT ON THE 2ND DAY OF MARCH, 2016, I CAUSED THE ORIGINAL **REPLY BRIEF OF APPELLANT** TO BE FILED IN THE **COURT OF APPEALS - DIVISION TWO** AND A TRUE COPY OF THE SAME TO BE SERVED ON THE FOLLOWING IN THE MANNER INDICATED BELOW:

[X] JOHN CROSS	()	U.S. MAIL
[kcpa@co.kitsap.wa.us]	()	HAND DELIVERY
KITSAP COUNTY PROSECUTING ATTORNEY	(X)	E-SERVICE VIA
614 DIVISION ST.		COA PORTAL
PORT ORCHARD, WA 98366-4681		
[X] TAMARA CHURCHILL	(X)	U.S. MAIL
802 CHERRY CT	()	HAND DELIVERY
BREMERTON, WA 98310	()	E-MAIL

SIGNED IN SEATTLE, WASHINGTON THIS 2ND DAY OF MARCH, 2016.



X _____

Washington Appellate Project
701 Melbourne Tower
1511 Third Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101
☎ (206) 587-2711

WASHINGTON APPELLATE PROJECT

March 02, 2016 - 4:21 PM

Transmittal Letter

Document Uploaded: 4-477564-Reply Brief.pdf

Case Name: STATE V. TAMARA CHURCHILL

Court of Appeals Case Number: 47756-4

Is this a Personal Restraint Petition? Yes ☐ No

The document being Filed is:

Designation of Clerk's Papers

Supplemental Designation of Clerk's Papers

Statement of Arrangements

Motion: _____

Answer/Reply to Motion: _____

☒ Brief: Reply

Statement of Additional Authorities

Cost Bill

Objection to Cost Bill

Affidavit

Letter

Copy of Verbatim Report of Proceedings - No. of Volumes: _____

Hearing Date(s): _____

Personal Restraint Petition (PRP)

Response to Personal Restraint Petition

Reply to Response to Personal Restraint Petition

Petition for Review (PRV)

Other: _____

Comments:

No Comments were entered.

Sender Name: Maria A Riley - Email: maria@washapp.org

A copy of this document has been emailed to the following addresses:

kcpa@co.kitsap.wa.us